



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,987	02/08/2002	Akira Takekuma	40004101-02	2039

7590 07/13/2004
Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

DOLAN, JENNIFER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2813

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/071,987

Applicant(s)

TAKEKUMA, AKIRA

Examiner

Jennifer M. Dolan

Art Unit

2813

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): none.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 4 and 5.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 6-14, 16-18.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Carl Whitehead, Jr.
CARL WHITEHEAD, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejections under Durocher and Itou '029 in view of Itou '185 stand. First, it is noted that the Applicant has ignored the rejections under Durocher in the Remarks filed 6/23/04 and 1/26/04. The examiner further disagrees with the arguments against Itou '029 in view of Itou '185. Since the applicant provided no special or explicit definition in the specification for what is encompassed by the term 'unitary', the Examiner is according the term the broadest reasonable interpretation, such that a unitary object is an object that forms a single unit or single cohesive entity. Hence, the structure of Itou '029, after being glued together into a cohesive, singular entity, would become a 'unitary' object. Furthermore, it is generally held in the art that making an object integral is merely a matter of routine skill in the art (see *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965)). To further illustrate this rationale, Itou '185 was cited to show that LED reflecting cups pinching the chip and using surface electrical traces, rather than wirebonds, for current delivery were known in the art to be formed in a unitary construction. The examiner further disagrees with the Applicant on the feasibility of combining the two Itou references, because the only teachings of Itou '185 used in the combination are those pertaining to using a unitary reflective cup, and the cup/chip/MID traces portion of the assemblies are substantially the same. Without any particular explicit definition of what is encompassed by a "unitary cup" and without evidence of an unexpected result due to having a cup formed from a single molding step over the result obtained from using a cup formed by joining two molded parts, the limitation of a "unitary cup" is either anticipated by or obvious over the Itou references. .